



Police & Crime Commissioner for Cleveland
Cleveland Police Headquarters
Ladgate Lane
Middlesbrough
TS8 9EH

Email: pcc@cleveland.pnn.police.uk
Website: <http://www.cleveland.pcc.police.uk>

Police and Crime Commissioner:
Chief of Staff (Chief Executive & Monitoring Officer):
Chief Constable:

Barry Coppinger
Simon Dennis BA, Solicitor
Jacqui Cheer QPM

Tel: 01642 301653
Tel: 01642 301653
Tel: 01642 301215

Report of the Police and Crime Commissioner to the Chair and Members of the Cleveland Police and Crime Panel

10 December 2015

Police and Crime Commissioner Update Report

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide members of the Police and Crime Panel with an update on key activities and updates from the Police and Crime Commissioner.

2.0 Cleveland Police Estates Update

2.1 The Cleveland Police Estates service is creating an effective property portfolio that aims to reduce the environmental impact and support the transformation of the organisation.

2.2 The Estates Blueprint report states that the vision is to create an efficient, fit-for-purpose and sustainable estate that delivers value for money and facilitates flexible working against the four main objectives of:

- Rationalisation - to maximise savings through the identification of underutilised estate premises.
- Modernisation - to create a fit-for-purpose and efficient core estate, which provides value for money and increases sustainability
- Property Asset Management - to organise and optimise performance by employing a team of skilled professionals
- Synergy - to support the Police Crime Commissioners Police & Crime Plan and Cleveland Police Operational Policing Plan and priorities.

- 2.3 The current focus is to lead on the transformation of the Police Estate as it adapts to requirements of the local policing review.
- 2.4 The change in requirements is allowing the Estates service to explore new and exciting opportunities to co-locate with public sector partners such as Cleveland Fire Brigade and local Council's and the ability to accommodate partner multi-agency teams within our own premises

3.0 Community Safety Hub Update

- 3.1 The Community Safety Hub Project has recently undergone a series of decisions. The joint data centre with North Yorkshire was reviewed following the purchase of Alverton Court at Northallerton, confirmation of costs for the data centre and the continued development and government drive for the progression of Cloud technology. This resulted in a joint decision to progress alternative solutions for the separate data centres as these would realise a greater level of efficiency and effectiveness for both forces.
- 3.2 As a result the main building is now in a process of re-design to accommodate IT services that were previously within the data centre, provide maximum value for money with the design but also considering how working practices can be changed to minimise the size of the building and therefore on-going costs. This process will result in a smaller building that will still be able to accommodate the majority of Cleveland Police HQ functions, space for multi-agency working and the public to use. The remaining Cleveland estate will also be considered to accommodate some of the Ladgate Lane teams. Final designs are now being developed and will be formally approved in March 2016.

4.0 HMIC Peel Inspection 2015

- 4.1 On 20th October, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) published their annual assessment of police effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy (PEEL). The methodology adopted across all Forces involved a review of both financial and workforce planning whilst examining wider questions of cost, capability and productivity. The inspection focused on the overall question, 'How efficient is the force at keeping people safe and reducing crime?' by assessing the following three areas:
- How well does the force use its resources to meet demand?
 - How sustainable and affordable is the workforce model?
 - How sustainable is the force's financial position for the short and long term?

4.2 As part of the inspection process HMIC collected data and plans then triangulated against interviews with senior members of the Force and 'reality tested' this with frontline officers. The inspection of Cleveland Police took place over a two day period in March 2015 with the overall judgement that the Force 'required improvement', with the same judgement reached in each of the three areas.

4.3 Four weeks prior to publication, the PCC wrote to HMIC Mike Cunningham expressing immediate concern regarding the method and outcomes of the inspection process. He highlighted the following areas:

- On initial scrutiny of the draft report, the Force had submitted over 70 individual points of feedback only 3 of which sounded a positive note.
- The PEEL inspection in Cleveland had taken place in March 2015. No indication of the emerging conclusion was given to the PCC until six months later.
- HMIC's inspection team did not speak with the PCC's Chief Finance Officer (CFO) during their visit and so conclusions could not fairly be drawn about the health of the organisation's financial management, without reference to the professional views of both organisations' CFOs. Good financial management is the cornerstone of everything undertaken by the Cleveland PCC and his Chief Constable. The PCC has high regard for the abilities and experience of both CFOs, who are respected locally and nationally, as well as commanding the confidence year on year of the District Auditor and the Joint Independent Audit Committee. The rightly-recognised very positive assessment of the work of the Force's CFO is impossible to reconcile with the overall judgement of the report.
- The fieldwork for the inspection renders its out-of-date conclusions misleading to the public, as the Force has moved on considerably since March 2015. In July, the PCC's CFO presented an updated plan (which is in the public domain¹) showing a balanced budget position in 2016/17 (based on revised assumptions) with a gap of only £500k (less than 1%) in 2017/18 and £1.5m in 2018/19 and was re-iterated again under further scrutiny in November². The position will continue to be monitored and revised throughout the financial year, particularly as the results of the Comprehensive Spending Review and Funding Formula Reviews become known. The public will find it deeply misleading to be presented with HMIC judgements which are at odds with information which has been published more recently.

¹ Long Term Financial Plan 2016/17 to 2019/20 and Capital Plans 2016/17 to 2019/20 Update - PCC CFO Report (Contained within embedded agenda for 27.7.15): <http://www.cleveland.pcc.police.uk/Document-Library/Scrutiny-Meetings/Finance/Agenda-Finances-Resources-Policy-Scrutiny-20.7.15.doc>

² Long Term Financial Plan 2016/17 to 2019/20 and Capital Plans 2016/17 to 2019/20 Update - PCC CFO Report (Contained within embedded agenda for 4.11.15): <http://www.cleveland.pcc.police.uk/Document-Library/Scrutiny-Meetings/Finance/Agenda-Finances-Resources-Policy-Scrutiny-4.11.15.doc>

4.4 HMIC responded stating that:

- Force feedback from the factual accuracy process does not change the judgment grades within the report.
- HMIC accept that the fieldwork process is taken as a moment in time and have reflected in both individual force reports and the national report that this year's inspection was undertaken at a time when future funding arrangements for the police were unclear.

4.5 The PCC sent a further letter to HMIC querying clarity on how grading criteria is assessed (i.e. baselines and standards used) and requested copies of collated inspection information and notes which supported the overall judgement. In return, HMIC explained that information is mostly gleaned from anonymous sources and forwarded only guidance previously sent to Forces.

4.6 It is the PCC's conclusion that the PEEL report flags up quite a big issue about the way the HMIC inspection process works. As the person with statutory responsibility for the totality of policing, the PCC's office uses only up-to-date information and relevant briefings to hold the Chief Constable to account and is at the centre of what happens in the Force day-to-day.

4.7 The latest medium-term financial plan takes us forward to the 2018/19 financial year, whilst at the same time the financial allocation from the Government for the coming year (i.e. from April 2016) is still to be determined.

4.8 Our Force employs a large number of workers from Teesside who are hardworking, committed and can see first-hand the fruits of their labour on the streets for which they work. This HMIC report does very little to improve their morale or confidence and is largely of no benefit to local residents who are supportive of the service that Cleveland Police delivers.

5.0 Transparency Quality Mark

5.1 On 28th October, the Cleveland PCC was awarded national recognition for openness and transparency.

5.2 The CoPaCC Transparency Quality Mark was presented for ensuring that 50 separate strands of mandated information (as set out in the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Specified Information) Order 2011 and the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Specified Information) (Amendment) Order 2012) were not only published on the PCC's website but was easily accessible to the public. The recognition was given to nine PCCs from around the country at a ceremony in London, attended by Lord Bew, Chair of the Committee on Standards in Public Life.

5.2 This award reflects very positively on the Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner. Openness and transparency is a key part of ensuring good governance. The team have worked hard to deliver on the PCC's commitment to making his services and decision-making open and transparent, as the public expect Compliance with this order can be found on the dedicated Specified Information Order webpage on the Cleveland PCC website.

6.0 Funding Formula for Policing

6.1 The initial consultation on a proposed 'Simplified' Funding Formula for Policing was undertaken during summer 2015. During the initial consultation process no details or calculations were provided to indicate the impact on each Force Area of the new proposed formula.

6.2 A further round of engagement on the Funding Formula was announced on the 8th October this was open until the end of October. At the same time as entering into this additional engagement the Government also provided details of what PCC's would have received in 2015/16 had the new Funding Formula been in place.

6.3 These exemplifications were subsequently shown to have been incorrectly calculated and therefore the Government has concluded that there should be a delay to the use of a new formula to allocate the central grant until 2017-18. Allocations for 2016-17 will therefore be made on the basis of current arrangements and will be announced in the usual way following the Spending Review.

6.4 The Government announced that 'The postponement will allow us to work with all police and crime commissioners and chief constables to identify the next steps and to ensure that we can deliver a reformed funding formula that all in policing can support.'

6.5 Had the proposed 'Simplified' Funding Formula been in place for 2015/16 then based on the calculation done by Devon and Cornwall, who brought the error in the Home Office's calculation to light, Cleveland would have received around £2m more funding than was actually received.

7.0 Autumn Statement 2015

7.1 Upon completion of this report the Autumn Statement 2015 was just announced. It is unclear how the announcement will impact the force budget at present but an update will be provided verbally at the meeting. However, the announcement was very much welcomed.

Barry Coppinger
Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland